REMARKS/COMMENTS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on August 9, 2007. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-12 and 14-20 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended the specification without adding any new matter; 2) amended claims 1, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 19; 3) added no new claims; and 4) argued the patentability of the Applicants' independent claim 1, 9, and 14. As such, claims 1-12 and 14-20 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following arguments and remarks.

Specification

In the Office Action mailed on August 9, 2007, the Examiner objected to the specification. The Applicants have made necessary modifications without adding new matter in the specification to comply with the objection. Therefore, the Office is requested to withdraw the objections to the specification.

In paragraph [0036], term JPS is replaced by "applications to be processed by the telematics control unit (TCU)". The support for this amendment is found on the Applicants' Specification in paragraph [0036] lines 15-22. Paragraph [0036] described that carlets can be written to control or monitor system components and applications.

In paragraph [0047], the Examiner objects to the replacement of "%" by "milliseconds". The Applicants respectfully submit that it is well known in the art that displays are generally updated in milliseconds intervals because updating the displays in seconds rather than milliseconds would trigger flickering and updating the displays in microseconds would waste computing resources for no benefit because human eyes would not be able to notice such fast updates. Use of symbol "%" in the original Specification was obviously a typographical error. Further, the symbol in question is being used in an example and any change one way or other does not appear to change the meaning of any other part of the Specification. Still further, the example in question is comparing two values of same type and the recital is geared toward describing that the draw manager comparatively performs less updates than the application, thereby optimizing the performance. Hence, use of a particular unit of measure will not affect the meaning of the recital one way or other.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112 1st paragraph

In the Office Action mailed on August 9, 2007, claims 1-12 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claims have been modified to rectify indefiniteness, as pointed out by the Examiner, in the claims. The Office is requested to withdraw the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph

In the Office Action mailed on August 9, 2007, claims 11, 12, and 19 were rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

Claims have been modified to rectify indefiniteness, as pointed out by the Examiner, in the claims. Claim 19 further limits a limitation of claim 14, i.e. "method operation of writing the data from the application buffer to the draw manager". The Applicants respectfully submit that no ambiguity has been created because claim 14 clearly shows this claim limitation. The Office is requested to withdraw the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

In the Office Action mailed on March 29, 2007, claims 1, 9, and, 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication no. 2003/0189597 (hereinafter "ANDERSON"), in view of US Patent no. 4,550,386 (hereinafter "HIROSAWA"). The background of the Applicants' specification was also used to reject the dependent claim 13. In the Office Action mailed on August 9, 2007, this rejection was held in abeyance. This rejection is respectfully traversed because the cited prior art references fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all limitations of the claims.

Claims 1, 9, and 14 have been amended to further clarify the structure of the methods and systems for displaying user interface in the telematics client. The subject matter of the claim 13 has been incorporated in the amended independent claims.

ANDERSON discloses a method for a user to preview multiple virtual desktops in a graphical user interface. The method includes receiving an indication from a user to preview the multiple virtual desktops and displaying multiple panes on the display. ANDERSON

does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the display is a part of the telematics client incorporated in a vehicle. Furthermore, ANDERSON teachings are different because ANDERSON discloses displaying multiple desktops simultaneously, i.e., displaying the user interface of several applications simultaneously whereas the display panel in claim 1 displays the image data of the user interface associated with only one application at a time. ANDERSON also does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the display is in commutation with applications that are running on the telematics server and transmitting image data to the display through a wireless network.

ANDERSON discloses a series of display screens (Fig. 5-7). The Examiner pointed out that since there are screen displays, a draw manager should exists. The Applicants respectfully submit that painting or drawing the screen displays in conventional computing systems is handled by display adapters. A display adapter is different than the draw manager as recited in the claims because the display adapter simply follows directions for screen updates from the applications, whereas, the draw manager as recited in the claims relieves the applications from screen update tasks. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that ANDERSON does not disclose a draw manager. Hence, ANDERSON could not disclose that the draw manager is configured to determine a rate of updating an object of the display image through an interpolation between values associated with most recent image data received from the application buffer and values associated with previous image data in the draw manager manipulation of the image data received from the application buffer.

The Examiner points out that ANDERSON inherently use "interpolation process" for manipulation of image data. The Applicants respectfully disagree because in a conventional system, the applications send the image data to the display adapter. The display adapter does not and needs not provide manipulation of the image data, i.e. inserting image data between two successively received image data from the applications. The display adapter is expected to simply transform the image data into a form that can be displayed by the display screen, the content of the image data is fully controlled by the application that is sending the image data to the display adapter. Further, since a display adapter in a conventional system is not aware of how and what exactly needs to be displayed in the next image data from the application, the Applicants respectfully submit that any effort by the display adapter to provide animation by interpolation would distort the image data on the display screen and/or would produce undesirable visual results.

HIROSAWA discloses displaying user interfaces of application programs which operate concurrently to be displayed on the split screen of a single terminal linked with the terminal controller. The terminal controller enables simultaneous execution of at least two programs from a terminal without needing any modifications of the existing application programs. HIROSAWA, however, does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the display is a part of the telematics client incorporated in a vehicle. HIROSAWA teachings are different because HIROSAWA is teaching simultaneously displaying the output of at least two application programs whereas the display panel in claim 1 displays the image data of the user interface associated with only one application at a time. HIROSAWA also does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the display is in communication with applications that are running on

the telematics server and transmitting image data to the display through a wireless network. HIROSAWA does not disclose a draw manager, hence, HIROSAWA could not disclose that the draw manager is configured to determine a rate of updating an object of the display image through an interpolation between values associated with most recent image data received from the application buffer and values associated with previous image data in the draw manager manipulation of the image data received from the application buffer.

The Examiner further points out that although ANDERSON and HIROSAWA are silent with regards to placing the computer into a vehicle, Applicants' admission of the prior art discusses placing computers into vehicles for various reasons, and in view of such disclosure, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the above combination of ANDERSON and HIROSAWA into a vehicle. The Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants admission of the prior art is different and actually teaches away from combining ANDERSON and HIROSAWA. It is well known in art that simultaneously displaying user interfaces of a plurality of user applications on the display screen is highly resource intensive and require greater data transmission bandwidth compared to displaying the user interface of only one application on the display screen at a time. Both ANDERSON and HIROSAWA disclose handling simultaneous display of more than one application on the desktop. Claim 1 discloses the applications executes on the telematics server, hence, much of the resource burden is transferred to the telematics server from the telematics client. ANDERSON and HIROSAWA, however, do not disclose that the applications run on the telematics server. Therefore, both ANDERSON and HIROSAWA disclose a system that is very resource intensive. The disclosure in the background information of Applicants'

specification suggests that a low resource and low bandwidth technique is needed for displaying user interfaces on a mobile device (see paragraph [006] and [007]), i.e., a device installed in a vehicle. Therefore, the teachings in the background of the Applicants' specification would actually discourage a person skilled in the art from combining ANDERSON and HIROSAWA.

Claim 9 is directed to a draw manager which is a component of a telematics client incorporated into a vehicle, the telematics client being in communication with a telematics server through a wireless network.

As discussed above, ANDERSON does not disclose, teach, or suggest a draw manager as recited in the claims. Further, HIROSAWA discloses Laboratory Automation Application Program (LAAP) screens that are directly coupled to application programs. HIROSAWA, however, does not disclose any existence of a component between the LAAP applications and LAAP screens to relieve the LAAP applications from managing the update of the LAAP screens. Hence, neither ANDERSON nor HIROSAWA teach nor disclose a draw manger which is a component of a telematics client incorporated into a vehicle and the telematics client being in communication with a telematics server through a wireless network. For the same reasons discussed in the arguments in support of the patentability of claim 1, neither ANDERSON nor HIROSAWA can be combined with the prior art disclosure of the Applicants' specification.

Claim 14 is directed to a computer implemented method for providing efficient updates for a display screen associated with a telematics system incorporated in a vehicle and in communication with a telematics service through a wireless network. Claim 14 is further directed to performing an interpolation between values associated with most recent the second image data of the draw manager and values associated with previous the first image data of the draw manager. The Applicants respectfully submit for the same reasons as discussed in support of the patentability of claims 1 and 9, neither ANDERSON nor HIROSAWA nor the background of the Applicants specification suggest, disclose, or teach all the limitations of claim 14.

Therefore, ANDERSON, HIROSAWA, and the prior art disclosure in Applicants' Specification, either separately or combined, fail to teach, suggest, or disclose, either expressly or inherently, all the elements of the Applicants' claims 1, 9, and, 14.

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and allowance of all claims now presented.

Conclusion

In view of these clarifying claims, the Applicants submit that the cited reference does not suggest the recited elements.

The Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6927.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No.SUNMP178). If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 408-774-6927.

Respectfully submitted,

Martine Penilla & Gencarella, LLP

Dated: October 22, 2007

Rajeev Madnawat
Reg. No. 57, 190

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Tel: (408) 749-6900
Fax: (408) 749-6901
Customer Number: **32291**